DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 021 SP 022 953

AUTHOR Emmer, Edmund T.; And Others
TITLE Improving Junior High Classroom Management.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC. Teaching and Learning Program.
PUB DATE Mar 83
GRANT OB-NIE-G-80-0116
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
AVAILABLE FROM Communications Services, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex 3.203, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Activities; Class Organization; Classroom Design; *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Instructional Design; *Junior High Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Student Behavior; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods; Time on Task

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted to determine whether descriptive-correlational results from classroom management research could be implemented by junior high school teachers, and whether such implementation would result in improved classroom management. An experimental group (18 teachers) received management manuals developed by researchers, and attended research-based workshops on class management, while a control group did not. In addition to observation-based data, information on performance was obtained from teachers' responses to a questionnaire assessing their reactions to each section of the manual, and interviews with teachers. Results are presented by management area: (1) room arrangement; (2) rules and procedures; (3) procedures for student accountability; (4) consequence systems; (5) first week activities; (6) maintaining skills, monitoring, and discipline; (7) instructional clarity; (8) organizing instruction; and (9) adjusting instruction for special groups. Comparisons of the two groups by management areas indicated that some recommendations were used more than others, with certain areas not showing evidence of implementation. Results indicated greater use by experimental teachers of recommended management behaviors and activities along with improved student classroom behavior during the first 2 months of the school year. However, observations made during the middle of the year did not detect significant differences between the groups. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234021

5P

Improving Junior High Classroom Management

Edmund T. Emmer
Julie P. Sanford
Barbara S. Clements
Jeanne Martin

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, CANADA, April 11-15,1983.

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

March 1983

This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Education, Contract OB-NIE-G-80-0116, P2, Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Program. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the NIE and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred. Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Communication Services, R&DCTE, Education Annex 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, U.S.A.

SP 022 953

Improving Junior High Classroom Management

Abstract

A field experiment was conducted to determine whether descriptive-correlational results from classroom management research could be implemented by junior high school teachers and whether such implementation would result in improved classroom management. An experimental group (n = 18) received management materials and workshops while a control group did not. Results from the study indicated greater use by the experimental teachers of the recommended management behaviors and activities along with improved student classroom behavior during the first two months of the school year. However, observations made during the middle of the year did not detect significant effects, although the absence of differences may have been the result of differential attrition in the two groups.

Teaching effectiveness literature from the past 10 years suggests the importance of classroom conditions that depend directly on the ability of teachers to organize and manage the classroom, including the productive use of class time (Borg, 1980; Frederick & Walberg, 1980), student attention to or involvement with learning activities, a goal-oriented, structured classroom environment, and opportunities for students to interact with the teacher in instructional activities of appropriate difficulty levels (Bloom, 1976; Brophy, 1979; Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cahen, & Dishaw, 1980; Good, 1979; Medley, 1977; Rosenshine, 1979; Good, Note 1).

Studies that afford a comprehensive picture of classroom management in typical school settings include Kounin's (1970) well known study and large scale studies conducted by the Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project (now named the Classroom Learning and Teaching Program) at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, the University of Texas at Austin. Kounin analyzed videotapes of 49 first and second grade classrooms and coded the behavior of selected children for work involvement and deviancy. He identified several dimensions of teacher management behavior that laid the groundwork for further classroom management research: Teacher withitness (or awareness and prompt and accurate desistance of deviant student behavior), smoothness and momentum during lesson presentations, group alerting and student accountability, and seatwork variety and challenge.

Building upon Kounin's work and related findings from teaching effectiveness research, Emmer, Evertson, and Anderson (1980) conducted a descriptive study of 28 elementary classrooms that included extensive observations starting on the first day of school and continuing through-

out the year. At the end of the study, identification of effective and less effective teachers (in terms of student behavior criteria, other teacher management criteria, and classroom achievement gains) and analysis of classroom data for these groups resulted in identification of effective classroom management strategies for establishing and maintaining good learning environments in elementary schools. Subsequently a large scale experimental study in grades one through six confirmed the importance of most of the variables identified in the descriptive study (Evertson, Emmer, Sanford, Clements, & Martin, in press).

Junior High School Management Studies

Relatively few longitudinal studies of classroom management in junior high grades have been conducted. One exception was a study by Moskowitz and Hayman (1976). This study compared management behaviors of "best" teachers (as nominated by students) and first year teachers in an inner-city junior high school. Classroom observations that began on the first day of school and continued periodically throughout the school year indicated that the two groups differed greatly on student off task behavior and that compared to first year teachers, best teachers used more orienting and climate setting behaviors at the beginning of school, gave more academic reinforcement and encouragement, and were more effective in controlling and responding to student behavior.

The direct precursor of the current experimental study was the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (JHCOS) (Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Emmer, Note 2) which investigated classroom management and organization in seventh and eighth grade English and mathematics classes, using a variety of classroom observation data and outcome measures. A total of 51 teachers in 11 schools participated in the

study, providing 102 classrooms: 52 mathematics classes (26 teachers) and 50 English classes (25 teachers).

A major focus of the JHCOS was identification of beginning-of-year dimensions of effective classroom management. In order to find out how teachers establish order and create productive learning environments in their classrooms, subsamples of more and less effective teachers were identified, using classroom data obtained after the first 3 weeks of school. Subsample selection criteria included average percent of students coded as off-task, average percent of students coded as on-task in academic activities, a management effectiveness score derived from observer end-of-year ratings, and adjusted (residual) class mean achievement. Once identified, the two groups were compared on a variety of measures of teaching behaviors during the first 3 weeks of school and later in the year. Several clusters of variables were found to differentiate more and less effective managers.

In order to test the effectiveness of identified classroom management strategies, results of the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (JHCOS) and related research were used to develop a teacher's manual describing major areas of classroom organization and management in junior high and middle school grades. Extensive descriptive data collected in JHCOS classes provided case studies and examples to help teachers understand the management principles and recommendations. The management manual and two half-day workshops at the beginning of the school year comprised the treatment provided to an experimental group of teachers. A control group of teachers received the manual and a

workshop after the end of the study. Classroom observations of both groups provided data to test the two general hypotheses of the study.

> Hypothesis 1. Teachers who are provided at the beginning of the school year with a manual and workshops describing effective management behaviors will subsequently exhibit more such behaviors than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

The specific management behaviors referred to in Hypothesis 1 are described in the teacher's manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High School Classroom, whose contents address nine areas of classroom organization and management:

1. Organizing the Room and Materials for the Beginning of School
2. Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures
3. Student Accountability
4. Consequences
5. Planning Activities for the First Week
6. Maintaining the Management System
7. Instructional Clarity
8. Organizing Instruction
9. Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups.

Teachers' implementation of recommended behaviors for each area of management were operationalized by classroom observation measures and variables are described elsewhere.[a]

> Hypothesis 2. Teachers provided with the manual and workshops at the beginning of the school year will establish and maintain better managed classes than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

---

[a]Copies of instruments and more detailed information about workshops, procedures, and results are available in Emmer, Sanford, Clements, and Martin (Note 3)

Better management was operationalized in terms of observed student behavior: higher rates of student engagement in classroom activities, and lower amounts of off-task unsanctioned, disruptive, and inappropriate student behavior.

Treatment Design

Treatment and control group formation. Thirty-eight teachers with 2 or fewer years of prior teaching experience in two school districts (A and B) were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Teachers were chosen from Grades 6, 7, and 8 in the subject areas of math, science, English, and social studies.

Description of treatment procedures. The major component of the JMIS experimental group procedure was teachers' use of the management manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom (Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements & Worsham, Note 4) which is based upon prior research conducted in the project. The manual is organized around nine chapters on classroom organization and management. Four chapters focus on planning a good system of management at the beginning of the school year (topics covered are room arrangement, procedures and rules, accountability procedures, and consequences). Three chapters present information on establishing and maintaining a well managed classroom (topics include activities for the first week of classes, monitoring, consistency, and instructional clarity). The final two chapters present information on instructional management (organizing instruction and adjusting instruction for special groups).

Teachers in the Experimental group in District A were given the manual at a workshop conducted 6 days prior to the first day of classes;

in District B teachers received the manual 7 days before school began. The first workshop for teachers in District B occurred 2 days before the first day of school. Teachers in both districts attended a second workshop during the third week of school. All but two teachers attended the first workshop; two teachers were absent from the second workshop. Both the beginning-of-year and the second workshop were half-day workshops with approximately 2 1/2 hours of actual instruction and discussion.

The workshops were organized to support the use of the manual, rather than for the presentation of additional management strategies. Procedures and activities in the two workshops were the same in Districts A and B. The same workshop leaders were used in both Districts A and B, except that one group leader did not participate in District B's activities. The before-school workshop was designed to introduce and highlight contents of the classroom management manual while encouraging interaction among teachers.

The second workshop was held during the third week of the school year. The purposes of this workshop were to refocus the attention of the teachers on parts of the manual that would be useful throughout the remainder of the school year, and to enable teachers to discuss management problems with other teachers and staff members. Two main areas were identified: instructional organization and behavior management. Staff members prepared brief case studies illustrating specific management problems observed in these two areas.

Data Collection

Twenty trained observers were used to gather classroom observation data. Training activities included reliability checks, practice with videotapes of classroom instruction, and other types of practice

exercises. Each teacher was observed in two classes beginning on the first day of school and extending through February, with emphasis given to the first 8 weeks of classes. Each teacher was observed from 16 to 18 times during the first 8 weeks of school and in January and February each teacher was observed four more times. Observers were assigned to teachers so that at least two observers saw each teacher on several occasions during both periods of observations. Several observation instruments were used. Narrative Records (NR) were a qualitative description of classroom events prepared by the observer during each observation. Student Engagement Rates (SER) were frequency counts of numbers of students on and off task in academic and procedural activities. Observer Ratings of Teachers (ORT) were summary ratings made at the end of the first 8 weeks and at the end of the January-February observations. Component Ratings (CR) were a series of scales used to assess teacher and student behavior on a wide array of variables at the end of each observation. The Narrative Reader Ratings (NRR) was an assessment form used by readers of the narratives in order to provide quantitative summaries of relevant variables. In addition to the observation based data, teachers completed a management questionnaire assessing their reactions to each section of the manual, and each teacher was interviewed at the conclusion of the study to gather information about the impact of the study on the teacher and their perceptions regarding management issues.

Results

This section will present the results of the data analyses for the two hypotheses.

Only the subset of variables that reflected the experimental treatment recommendations was used for the test of this hypothesis. Selected variables from each instrument were grouped into one of the nine management areas. The variable means and associated probability levels for the significance test of the difference between means (ANOVA) on each of these variables are presented in Table 1. All the significance tests in Table 1 are based on a one way analysis of variance, with one and 36 degrees of freedom for the $\underline{F}$ ratio and a nondirectional alternate hypotheses (i.e., $M_E \neq M_C$). The results, presented by management area, are summarized briefly below.

1. Room arrangement. None of the three indicator variables in this area showed a significant difference between the two groups, and only one test approached significance ($\underline{p} = .07$). Thus no evidence exists for implementation in this area.

2. Rules and procedures. Of the 17 variables in this area, 11 were significant ($\underline{p} < .05$) and two others approached significance. Treatment group managers had more appropriate and efficient classroom procedures and fewer problems with students in areas such as speaking without permission, being out of seat, talking during class activities, and other classroom conduct areas.

3. Procedures for student accountability. Of the 11 indicator variables in this area, seven produced significant differences favoring the experimental group, with three other variables approaching significance. Experimental group teachers monitored student progress more closely, enforced work standards more consistently, and had better routines for communicating assignments to students.

4. Consequences. Experimental group teachers had more effective consequence systems, were more consistent in their use of penalties, and rewarded appropriate behavior more than control group teachers. Tests of the six indicator variables in this area showed three significant differences and two others approaching significance.

5. Activities for the first week. Experimental group teachers taught the rules and procedures more effectively and provided more review and feedback to students in this area. Of the nine tests of group differences, two were significant and two others approached significance.

6. Maintaining skills. Experimental group teachers were better at monitoring student behavior, were more consistent in their management behaviors, and stopped inappropriate student behavior more quickly. They were less likely to ignore misbehavior and more apt to cite their rules and procedures when dealing with inappropriate behavior. Eight of the nine indicator variables in this area showed significant differences favoring the experimental group.

7. Instructional clarity. Experimental teachers were rated as being more likely to wait for student attention before giving instructions and to monitor student understanding during presentations. Of the seven variables in this area, two showed significant differences between the experimental and control groups.

8. Organizing instruction. Experimental group teachers conducted more efficient transitions, were more likely to have enough work for students, and had fewer problems associated with running out of things for students to do. Of 10 significance tests of variables, six showed

differences in favor of the experimental group and one other difference approached significance.

9. Adjusting instruction for special groups. No treatment impact could be identified in this area. Of the three indicator variables none were significant and only one approached significance.

Additional information on implementation of the management recommendations was obtained from the teacher's responses to the manual questionnaire and to selected interview questions. These data indicate that on the average, the treatment was viewed as a moderate source of change for the experimental group teachers who also tended to regard the information about the beginning-of-year planning and implementation material as more useful than contents later in the manual.

Treatment effects in January and February were examined using the same measures as in the first 8 weeks. Unfortunately, differential sample attrition occurred such that four teachers were lost from the experimental group and five teachers from the control group. When the reduced experimental and control group samples were compared, few significant differences were found. The differences between the groups favor the experimental condition in most cases, but generally not at statistically significant ($p < .05$) levels. Further analyses indicated that the sample attrition was differential for the two groups in that the four experimental group teachers had been on the average relatively effective managers during the first 8 weeks of observation, and the five control group teachers had been on the average relatively poor managers. Thus, the absence of treatment effects in the January and February data may be due either to differential attrition of teachers from the groups or to a diminished treatment effect, or to both factors.

Effects on Student Behavior

Hypothesis 2. Teachers provided with the manual and workshops at the beginning of the school year will establish and maintain better managed classes than will teachers not receiving the manual and workshops.

Hypothesis 2 was tested using several student behavior variables as indicators of management effectiveness. Three of these variables were taken from the Component Ratings: disruptive behavior, inappropriate behavior, and task orientation. Two other variables were obtained from the SER instrument and are based on frequency counts of students on and off task: proportion of students who were off task unsanctioned and proportion of students who were on task during each observation. In order to check for differential change across time periods, these data were aggregated separately for observations in Week 1, Weeks 2 through 4, and Weeks 4 through 8 (approximately equal numbers of observations in time periods). Data were analyzed using a group-by-time periods repeated measures ANOVA. Means and significance levels for each variable are shown in Table 2. Group effects favoring the experimental group were found for the off task and on task variables and for the task orientation assessment. The significance test for inappropriate behavior approached significance ($p = .06$), while the means for disruptive behavior, although favoring the experimental groups, were not significantly different. Some effects for time periods were noted; however, no interactions between group and time were significant, indicating no diminution (or increase) in treatment impact. The absence of effect for the disruptive behavior variable might be attributable to the relatively low occurrence of disruption in most classes in the sample.

A comparison of treatment and control groups means for the student behavior variables during the January--February observations yielded results similar to the teacher implementation results for the same time period. Differences between the groups were generally not statistically significant.

A Check for Halo

Differences between the experimental and the control groups rely on data obtained from observers who could be potentially influenced by their overall impressions of teachers. Should such bias be present in the data, then inferences about treatment effects could also be biased, although observers did not know group assignments of teachers. For example, if an observer formed a positive impression of an experimental group teacher because of higher rates of on task behavior, then that observer might be more likely to assess other aspects of the teacher's behavior favorably. This bias could cause the teacher to receive higher implementation scores in particular management areas when in fact no implementation occurred. A check for such bias was made by selecting (prior to an examination of the data) seven teacher behavior variables that are not directly related to the treatment but are potentially susceptible to observer halo effects. These variables were chosen because they are easily associated with assumed good or bad teacher traits (e.g., Teacher was warm and pleasant, Class has a relaxed, pleasant atmosphere, Teacher used criticism). Using data from the first 8 weeks, one way ANOVAs of experimental vs. control group means were computed. Results are presented in Table 3. No significant differences were obtained, nor did any result approach significance. Thus no

evidence was found that suggests the experimental-control group differences are the result of observer halo.

Discussion

The comparisons of the experimental and control groups on measures of treatment implementation and management outcomes during Weeks 1 through 8 indicated that the treatment recommendations were used by the experimental group teachers to a greater degree than by control group teachers, and resulted in improved classroom management in the experimental teachers' classes. The comparisons of the two groups by management areas indicated that some recommendations were used more than other areas, with certain areas not showing evidence of implementation.

Where successful, the treatment implementation and the improvement in student behavior appears to be the result of several factors. The treatment focused on content which addressed a high concern level for a number of the teachers in the main sample, and most areas of the treatment manual were perceived as appropriate and containing useful recommendations. In spite of the short period of time for studying the materials prior to the beginning of classes and other factors competing for the teachers' attention during this time, the evidence from the questionnaire and the interview data indicates that most of the teachers did read much of the material. Furthermore, the treatment recommendations were not viewed as highly novel or as requiring unusual behavior or effort on the teachers' part. In fact, many teachers reported that they had encountered most of the ideas before but that they were helped by the material being organized and presented in a manner they could use in their classes. Finally, the teachers themselves reported they used the treatment recommendations in their teaching, that student behavior

was improved, and that this improvement was due in large part to their participation in the study. These perceptions no doubt encouraged teachers to make continued use of the recommendations and to be successful in their efforts to achieve good class management.

The experimental treatment in the study was mainly informational, with no opportunity for feedback, directed practice, diagnosis with targeted intervention, or continued support and encouragement from staff or colleagues. Thus the treatment conforms to the type frequently noted in the literature as a minimal intervention, as has been the case for several other successful studies using the same paradigm of basing a field experiment on prior process-product research on teaching. This study, as did the others, offered teachers a variety of recommendations and allowed them to use or to adapt whichever they wished. Such an approach produces a multi-faceted treatment and an inability to specify with certainty which treatment components contributed to the better management observed in the classrooms of experimental group teachers. It seems reasonable that various aspects of the treatment recommendations were important for different teachers, as the teachers themselves suggested in their interviews. While this type of intervention appears effective when it is directed at an area of high teacher concern and when a broad base of information and suggestions are available to offer teachers, other approaches, such as a diagnostic-prescriptive treatment, might be more suited for other types of teachers or objectives. Furthermore, other approaches might be necessary to sustain a treatment impact produced by a mainly informational program.

A major limitation of the results for the main sample was the inability to verify a long term effect, due to the differential

attrition from the experimental and control groups. However, even granting that the experimental group losses were of relatively good managers and that the control group losses were from the poor managers in that group, the fact is that the treatment effects were not evident after a loss of 25% of the sample. Consequently, we cannot argue that the treatment produced a broad, pervasive and lasting impact on most of the experimental teachers. Although no pre-experiment observations were possible given that the treatment was intended for the beginning of the year, extrapolation from the control group data indicates the likelihood that the experimental group had a number of teachers who were already good managers when the study began. Thus, it seems unlikely that this treatment could have had a pronounced effect on them. In addition, there were undoubtedly a few experimental group teachers who were unable to take advantage of the information offered to them. Thus, the likelihood is that the treatment had a slight impact on some of the teachers, a moderate effect on others, and a strong impact on a few teachers.

Reference Notes

1. Good, T. Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know (R&D Rep. No. 9018). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

2. Emmer, E. Effective classroom management in junior high school mathematics classrooms (R&D Rep. No. 6111). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1981.

3. Emmer, E., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Martin, J. Improving classroom management and organization in junior high schools: An experimental investigation (R&D Rep. 6153). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

4. Emmer, E., Evertson, C., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Worsham, M. Organizing and managing the junior high school classroom (R&D Rep. No. 6151). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

References

Bloom, B. Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Borg, W. R. Time and school learning. In C. Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Brophy, J. E. Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71(6), 733-750.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80(5), 219-231.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1982, 74(4), 485-498.

Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., & Clements, B. S. Improving classroom management: An experiment in elementary classrooms. Elementary School Journal, in press.

Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, M/. Marliave, R., Cahan, L., & Dishaw, M. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Frederick, C. W., & Walberg, H. J. Learning as a function of time. Journal of Educational Research, 1980, 73, 183-194.

Good, T. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30(2), 52-64.

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Medley, D. Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Moskowitz, G., & Hayman, J. Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A year-long study. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69, 283-289.

Rosenshine, B. Content, time, and direct instruction. In P. L. Peterson and H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1979.

Table 1

Indicators of Manual Implementation

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Chapter 1: Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School			
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	4.16	4.04	ns
Efficient use of classroom space (ORT16)	4.02	3.75	ns
During the first 5 days of school room is orderly, well organized (NRR1)	4.28	3.90	.07
Chapter 2: Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures			
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	4.14	3.75	.01
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	3.88	3.43	.03
Efficient opening and closing routines (CR3e)	3.67	3.02	<.001
Manages interruptions (CR9d)	4.28	3.93	.04
Frequency of wandering that is not task related (ORT3)	1.57	2.28	.02
Frequency of come ups while teacher is engaged with other students (ORT7)	1.85	2.36	.06
Frequency with which students approach teacher when they need help (ORT11)	2.28	3.11	<.01
Frequency with which students raise hands when they need help from teacher (ORT12)	3.87	3.27	.001

Note: CR = Component Ratings; AdCR = Addendum Component Ratings; ORT = Observer Ratings of Teacher; NRR = Narrative Reader Ratings

Table 1, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Frequency with which students call out when they need help (ORT13)	2.01	2.91	<.01
Frequent problems with students not bringing materials to class (NRR18)	2.06	1.95	ns
Problems with beginning class procedures (NRR23)	2.25	2.75	.08
Problems with tardiness procedures (NRR24)	2.14	2.13	ns
Problems with procedures for students leaving the room (NRR25)	1.67	1.98	ns
Problems with ending-class procedures (NRR26)	1.94	2.48	.04
Problems with student talk during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR27)	2.86	3.50	.02
Problems with response/questions during whole class or seatwork activities (NRR28)	2.61	2.98	ns
Problems with students out of seat during whole class/seatwork activities (NRR29)	2.14	2.98	<.001
Chapter 3: Student Accountability			
Consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	3.68	3.12	.01
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work (CR3d)	3.85	3.51	.02
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work (ORT24)	4.13	3.55	.03
Effective routines for communicating assignments (ORT25)	4.25	3.62	.01

Table 1, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Regular academic feedback to students (NRR3)	3.64	3.20	.10
Work requirements are clear (NRR4)	3.72	3.25	.06
Deadlines are enforced consistently (NRR5)	3.64	3.25	.06
Consistent routines for communicating assignments to students (NRR6)	3.97	3.28	<.01
Effectively monitors students' progress and completion of assignments (NRR7)	3.83	3.33	.02
Regular, efficient routines for checking, turning in, and grading work (NRR8)	3.81	3.28	.03
Teacher clearly ties class activities to grading system (NRR14)	3.56	3.28	ns
Chapter 4: Consequences			
Rewards appropriate behavior (CR5b)	2.50	1.94	.03
Rewards or positive consequences for appropriate behavior are clearly defined (NRR10)	2.28	1.65	.07
Rewards or positive consequences are used consistently (NRR11)	2.28	1.75	.10
Negative consequences are clearly defined (NRR12)	3.22	2.80	ns
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently (NRR13)	3.08	2.13	.001
System of consequences is appropriate, sufficient, and effective (NRR15)	3.53	2.63	<.01

Table 1, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Chapter 5: Planning Activities for the First Week			
Teacher presents reviews or discusses rules and procedures (ADCR1)	3.09	2.61	.06
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear (ADCR2)	3.92	3.69	ns
Rationale for rules and procedures is explained (ADCR3)	3.05	2.77	ns
Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice (ADCR4)	1.96	1.43	.07
Teacher provides feedback or review of rules and procedures (ADCR5)	2.93	2.32	.04
Teacher stays in charge of all students (ADCR6)	4.59	4.38	ns
Materials are ready (CR1c--First week only)	4.31	4.45	ns
Conveys value or curriculum (CR8a--First week only)	3.04	2.49	ns
Procedures and rules are well taught (NRR9)	3.86	3.10	<.01
Chapter 6: Maintaining Your Management System			
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5d)	3.70	3.14	.02
Effective monitoring (CR5e)	3.87	3.10	<.001
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption (CR6d)	2.17	2.07	ns
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	3.86	3.18	<.01
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	2.65	2.07	.02

Table 1, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Ignores inappropriate behavior (CR7i)	2.25	2.89	.01
Teacher lets class get out of hand with half or more pupils off task (ORT2)	1.68	2.51	.03
Teacher handles disruptions well (ORT15)	4.23	3.50	.04
Teacher monitors at the beginning of activities (NRR16)	3.61	2.95	<.01
Chapter 7: Instructional Clarity			
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	3.35	3.05	ns
Clear directions (CR1d)	3.91	3.68	ns
Waits for attention (CR1e)	3.84	3.30	.02
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	3.77	3.49	ns
Monitors student understanding (CR1j)	3.72	3.19	<.01
When giving instructions teacher questions to determine student understanding (ORT23)	3.61	3.17	ns
Frequency of digressions, irrelevant comments, and sustained interruptions during instruction (NRR22)	1.75	1.93	ns
Chapter 8: Organizing Instruction			
Materials are ready (CR1c)	4.47	4.40	ns
Appropriate pacing of lessons (CR1h)	3.64	3.37	ns
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4c)	3.62	3.28	.06

Table 1, continued

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
What is the efficiency of transitions? (ORT6)	4.07	3.45	.03
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students (ORT18)	4.47	3.72	.001
Teacher allows activities to continue too long (ORT20)	2.23	2.54	ns
Typical assignments are too short or easy (ORT21)	1.62	2.07	.03
Effective conduct of transitions (NRR17)	3.64	3.08	.02
Frequent problems with use of materials, supplies, and equipment in class (NRR19)	1.50	2.10	<.01
Problems with students after they complete work during whole class/ seatwork activities (NRR30)	2.36	3.00	.02
Chapter 9: Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups			
Student success (CR4a)	4.05	3.77	.10
Different assignments and activities for different students (CR1g)	1.29	1.25	ns
Needs of highest and lowest ability students are not being met (NRR21)	2.14	2.50	ns

Table 2

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of Classroom Management Variables

Variable	Main effects for groups: Treatment (n = 18)	Main effects for groups: Control (n = 20)	Main effects for groups: p	Main effects for time: Week 1	Main effects for time: Weeks 2 to 4	Main effects for time: Weeks 5 to 8	Main effects for time: p	Interaction p
Component Rating Variables (5-point scale)								
Disruptive behavior	1.31	1.53	ns	1.34	1.35	1.57	.02	ns
Inappropriate behavior	2.13	2.63	.06	2.35	2.34	2.46	ns	ns
Task orientation	3.79	3.41	.05	3.63	3.61	3.56	ns	ns
Student Engagement Variables								
Proportion of students off-task, unsanctioned	.04	.06	.04	.04	.05	.06	<.01	ns
Proportion of students on-task	.91	.85	.01	.88	.89	.86	.07	ns

Table 3

Differences Between Experimental and Control Group Averages on Variables Potentially Susceptible to Halo Errors, But Not Directly Related to the Treatment

Variables	Treatment Group Means (n = 18)	Control Group Means (n = 20)	p
Class had relaxed pleasant atmosphere (CR8c)	3.68	3.55	ns
Teacher used criticism to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7g)	1.18	1.18	ns
Participation in discussion and recitation (CR9f)	3.17	3.10	ns
Teacher was warm and pleasant (ORT35)	3.53	3.54	ns
Teacher was enthusiastic (ORT36)	3.50	3.14	ns
Showmanship of teacher (ORT37)	2.59	2.36	ns
Encourages analysis, builds reasoning skills (CR1f)	2.95	2.67	ns